

EFFECTIVE REPRESENTATIONS OF HECKE-KISELMAN MONOIDS OF TYPE A_n

LOVE FORSBERG

ABSTRACT. We prove effectiveness of certain representations of Hecke-Kiselman monoids of type A_n constructed by Ganyushkin and Mazorchuk and also construct further classes of effective representations for these monoids. As a consequence the effective dimension of monoids of type A_n is determined. We also show that odd Fibonacci numbers F_{2n+1} appear as the cardinality of certain bipartite HK-monoids and count the number of multiplicity free elements in any HK-monoid of type A_n .

1. INTRODUCTION

Let S be a monoid and \mathcal{R} an integral commutative domain. A (finite dimensional) linear representation of S over \mathcal{R} is a homomorphism φ from S to the semigroup $\text{Mat}_{n \times n}(\mathcal{R})$ of $n \times n$ matrices over \mathcal{R} . The representation φ is called *effective* if different elements of S are represented by different matrices. Note that a faithful representation of the semigroup algebra $\mathcal{R}S$ induces an effective representation of S , but the converse is false in general. The least $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that S has an effective representation in $\text{Mat}_{n \times n}(\mathcal{R})$ is called the *effective dimension* (of S over \mathcal{R}) and is denoted by $\text{eff. dim}_{\mathcal{R}}(S)$. For finite semigroups the problem of determining $\text{eff. dim}_{\mathcal{R}}(S)$ is effectively computable when \mathcal{R} is an algebraically closed or a real closed field, see [9], but giving the answer as a closed formula is usually very hard.

C. Kiselman defined in [7] a monoid generated by three operators c, l, m with origins in convexity theory and showed that it has presentation

$$(1.1) \quad K = \langle c, l, m : c^2 = c, l^2 = l, m^2 = m, \\ clc = lcl = lc, cmc = mcm = mc, lml = mlm = ml \rangle.$$

In [7] it was shown that K has 2^3 idempotents and that K has an effective representation by (non-negative) integer valued 3×3 -matrices.

O. Ganyushkin and V. Mazorchuk generalized K to a series of monoids K_n , called *Kiselman monoids* (unpublished) given by the following presentation:

$$K_n = \langle c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n : c_i^2 = c_i \ \forall i, c_i c_j c_i = c_j c_i c_j = c_i c_j \ \forall i \leq j \rangle.$$

It was shown by G. Kudryavtseva and V. Mazorchuk in [8] that K_n is a finite monoid with 2^n idempotents and that K_n has an effective representation by (non-negative) integer valued $n \times n$ -matrices. The proof of the latter fact is technically rather involved.

Let $\Gamma = (V(\Gamma), E(\Gamma))$ be a graph representing a disjoint union of simply laced Dynkin diagrams, W_Γ the corresponding Weyl group and $\mathcal{H}_q(W_\Gamma)$, where $q \in \mathcal{R}$, the Hecke algebra of W_Γ . By specializing $q = 0$ we obtain an algebra which is isomorphic to the monoid algebra of the so-called *0-Hecke monoid* \mathcal{H}_Γ which has the following presentation:

$$(1.2) \quad \mathcal{H}_\Gamma = \langle v \in V(\Gamma) : v^2 = v \ \forall v, \\ v w v = w v w \text{ for all } \{v, w\} \in E(\Gamma), v w = w v \text{ for all } \{v, w\} \notin E(\Gamma) \rangle.$$

O. Ganyushkin and V. Mazorchuk proposed in [4] a common generalization for K_n and \mathcal{H}_Γ by introducing the so-called *Hecke-Kiselman monoids* which are defined as follows.

Definition 1.1. Let $\Gamma = (V(\Gamma), E(\Gamma))$ be a simple directed graph, i.e. a directed graph with no loops and at most one edge $x \rightarrow y$ for every ordered pair (x, y) . The *Hecke-Kiselman monoid* HK_Γ of Γ is the quotient of the free monoid $(V(\Gamma))^*$ by the following relations:

- (I) $x^2 = x$ for all $x \in V(\Gamma)$.
- (II) If there is no edge between x and y , then $xy = yx$.
- (III) If there is an edge from x to y but no edge from y to x , then $xyx = yxy = xy$.
- (IV) If there are edges in both directions between x and y , then $xyx = yxy$.

We refer to the above relations (including $x^2 = x$) as *edge relations*. Since there is no risk of confusion we will use $x \in \Gamma$ as a shorthand for $x \in V(\Gamma)$. A pair of vertices satisfying (II) is said to be *non-adjacent*.

It is often convenient to think of a pair of edges $x \rightarrow y$ and $y \rightarrow x$ in Γ as a single undirected edge. In order to simplify statements this identification is done for the rest of the paper. The 0-Hecke monoid is recovered as a Hecke-Kiselman monoid by using the same (simply laced) Dynkin diagram and treating the edges as undirected edges. The Kiselman monoid K_n corresponds to the directed graph κ_n with vertices $V(\kappa_n) = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and edges $E(\kappa_n) = \{(i, j) | 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$. We call this graph the *Kiselman graph*. O. Ganyushkin and V. Mazorchuk proved that the semigroups HK_Γ and $HK_{\Gamma'}$ are isomorphic if and only if Γ and Γ' are isomorphic graphs [4].

Mixed graphs and the corresponding Hecke-Kiselman monoids have been found to be a suitable mileau to study computer simulations which discretize continuous dynamical systems, via so-called sequential dynamical systems [3]¹.

Definition 1.2. A simple directed graph Γ is said to be of *type A_n* if its underlying undirected graph is the Dynkin diagram A_n for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A graph of type A_n with exactly one sink and one source is called *linearly ordered*. The special case when sink and source coincide can only happen when $n = 1$. A *canonical order* on the vertices of a graph of type A_n is one where neighboring vertices have indices

¹The paper by Collina and D'Andrea cites this paper, due to a long period where a draft of this paper was available arXiv. However, these citations are not needed for the strictly mathematical content, but only as a guide to the reader.

that differ by 1. There are two canonical orders on a graph of type A_n ($n \geq 2$). If the graph is linearly ordered, we additionally ask that the canonical order is from the source to the sink, i.e.

$$v_1 \longrightarrow v_2 \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow v_n .$$

We say that HK_Γ is of type A_n if Γ is of type A_n . The monoids HK_Γ of type A_n naturally appear as monoids of projection functors as defined by A.-L. Gensing in [5, 10], see also some further development in [6].

In view of the above the following questions arise naturally:

- (1) Does HK_Γ have 2^n idempotents, where $n = |V(\Gamma)|$ is the number of vertices? If not, how many?
- (2) Does HK_Γ have an effective representation by $n \times n$ -matrices over \mathbb{Z} ?
- (3) For which graphs Γ is the Hecke-Kiselman monoid HK_Γ finite? Can we calculate its cardinality, either explicitly or with some algorithm?

The second question seems to be a question about one ring, but a representation with only integer entries works universally for all rings of characteristic 0.

These are the questions which we address in the present paper for various families of graphs. After the first version of the present paper appeared, R. Aragona and A. D'Andrea addressed the cardinality problem in the case Γ is small (has at most four vertices) and discovered a nontrivial example of a graph with an unoriented edge for which the cardinality of the Hecke-Kiselman monoid is infinite, see [2]. In this paper we study only graphs for which there are no unoriented edges, or, equivalently, there is at most one oriented edge between any pair of vertices.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we collected some basic notation and definitions from the combinatorics of words. Section 3 contains some preliminary results on linear representations of some Hecke-Kiselman monoids. In Section 4 we discuss effective representations and cardinalities of the Hecke-Kiselman monoids considered in Section 3. In Section 5 we investigate obstructions to generalize our methods to further classes of Hecke-Kiselman monoids.

All representations in this paper are linear. We set $\underline{n} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

2. WORDS, CONTENT AND CANONICAL PROJECTIONS

If Γ is a disjoint union of Γ_1 and Γ_2 , then it is easy to see that

$$HK_\Gamma = HK_{\Gamma_1} \oplus HK_{\Gamma_2}.$$

Thus we only need to study connected graphs.

We will use the bold font to denote a word $\mathbf{w} \in (V(\Gamma))^*$. Elements in HK_Γ are equivalence classes of words and are denoted by brackets: $[\mathbf{w}] \in HK_\Gamma$. The empty word is denoted by ε . We will make use of two binary relations on $(V(\Gamma))^*$:

$$\mathbf{w} \sim \mathbf{w}' : \iff [\mathbf{w}] = [\mathbf{w}'], \text{ and}$$

$$\mathbf{w} \approx \mathbf{w}' : \iff (\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{xyz} \text{ and } \mathbf{w}' = \mathbf{xy'z}, \text{ where } \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}' \text{ is an edge relation or } \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}')$$

Note that \sim is an equivalence relation while \approx is not. Moreover, \sim is the transitive closure of \approx . Hence the statement $\mathbf{w} \approx \mathbf{w}'$ is stronger than the statement $\mathbf{w} \sim \mathbf{w}'$.

For each word \mathbf{w} we may define the *content* $\mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{w}) \subset V(\Gamma)$ as the set of vertices that appear at least once in \mathbf{w} . Note that the equality $\mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{w}) = \mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{w}')$ holds for each of the edge relations $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}'$. Since $\mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{xyz}) = \mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{x}) \cup \mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{y}) \cup \mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{z})$, this implies $\mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{w}) = \mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{w}')$ when $\mathbf{w} \approx \mathbf{w}'$, and, by transitivity, when $\mathbf{w} \sim \mathbf{w}'$. Thus we may define the content $\mathfrak{c}([\mathbf{w}])$ for each element in $[\mathbf{w}] \in HK_\Gamma$. Note that $\mathfrak{c}([\mathbf{w}][\mathbf{w}']) = \mathfrak{c}([\mathbf{w}]) \cup \mathfrak{c}([\mathbf{w}'])$. In particular $\mathfrak{c}([\mathbf{w}]) = \mathfrak{c}([\mathbf{w}'])$ implies $\mathfrak{c}([\mathbf{w}]) = \mathfrak{c}([\mathbf{ww}'])$, which in turn implies that the set of elements with a fixed content form a subsemigroup. Thus HK_Γ is Λ -graded, where Λ is the lattice consisting of subsets of $V(\Gamma)$ and with usual join and meet.

Let $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$ be a subgraph. Then $HK_{\Gamma'}$ is a quotient of HK_Γ in the natural way. If Γ' is a full subgraph, then $HK_{\Gamma'}$ is a submonoid of HK_Γ , and the function defined by sending each $x \in V(\Gamma')$ to itself and each $x \in V(\Gamma \setminus \Gamma')$ to ε extends uniquely to a homomorphism $p : HK_\Gamma \rightarrow HK_{\Gamma'}$ which is called the *canonical projection onto $HK_{\Gamma'}$* . This slight misuse of the word *projection* is justified by the fact that it linearizes to a projection in the semigroup algebras.

3. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Let \mathcal{R} be an integral domain and $W = \bigoplus_{v \in V(\Gamma)} \mathcal{R}v$ the formal vector space over \mathcal{R} with basis $V(\Gamma)$. Let $f : E(\Gamma) \rightarrow \mathcal{R} \setminus \{0\}$ be a function (we will call it a *weight function*). We denote the weight on the edge from x to y by f_{xy} (assuming it exists). For arbitrary vertices x and y , set

$$\theta_x^f(y) = \begin{cases} y, & x \neq y; \\ \sum_{z \rightarrow x} f_{zx}z, & x = y; \end{cases}$$

and extend this by linearity to an endomorphism of W . The empty sum, which happens when $x = y$ is source, is defined to be 0, as usual. Define the map $R_f : V(\Gamma) \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{R}}(W)$ by $x \mapsto \theta_x^f$. This uniquely extends to a homomorphism $R_f : (V(\Gamma))^* \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{R}}(W)$ using the fact that $V(\Gamma)$ is a set of free generators of $(V(\Gamma))^*$. The endomorphisms θ_x^f will be called *atomic*. If the weight function is fixed in advance, we sometimes omit it from the notation and write simply θ_x for θ_x^f . This construction generalizes the construction of “linear integral representations” in [4], and the following statement generalizes [4, Proposition 7].

Theorem 3.1. *R_f induces a well-defined homomorphism $HK_\Gamma \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{R}}(W)$.*

Proof. We have to check that R_f respects the edge relations. We start with the relation $x^2 = x$. Since Γ is simple, an edge $z \rightarrow x$ implies $z \neq x$. Thus

$$\theta_x \circ \theta_x(y) = \begin{cases} y, & x \neq y; \\ \sum_{z \rightarrow x} f_{zx}\theta_x(z), & x = y \end{cases} = \begin{cases} y, & x \neq y; \\ \sum_{z \rightarrow x} f_{zx}z, & x = y \end{cases} = \theta_x(y).$$

Relation $xy = yx$ for x and y different and non-adjacent.

$$\theta_x \circ \theta_y(z) = \begin{cases} \theta_x(z), & y \neq z; \\ \sum_{\omega \rightarrow y} f_{\omega y} \theta_x(\omega), & y = z \end{cases} = \begin{cases} z, & x, y \neq z; \\ \sum_{\omega \rightarrow x} f_{\omega x} \omega, & x = z; \\ \sum_{\omega \rightarrow y} f_{\omega y} \omega, & y = z. \end{cases}$$

As the right hand side is symmetric in x and y , so is the left hand side.

Relation $xyx = yxy = xy$ when there is a directed edge from x to y .

$$\theta_x \circ \theta_y \circ \theta_x(z) = \begin{cases} \theta_x \circ \theta_y(z), & x \neq z; \\ \sum_{\omega \rightarrow x} f_{\omega x} \theta_x \circ \theta_y(\omega), & x = z \end{cases} = \begin{cases} z, & x, y \neq z; \\ \sum_{\omega \rightarrow y} f_{\omega y} \theta_x(\omega), & y = z; \\ \sum_{\omega \rightarrow x} f_{\omega x} \omega, & x = z. \end{cases}$$

Since there is a directed edge from x to y we have

$$\sum_{\omega \rightarrow y} f_{\omega y} \theta_x(\omega) = \sum_{\omega \rightarrow y, x \neq \omega} f_{\omega y} \omega + f_{xy} \sum_{\omega \rightarrow x} f_{\omega x} \omega.$$

On the other hand

$$\theta_x \circ \theta_y(z) = \begin{cases} \theta_x(z), & y \neq z; \\ \sum_{\omega \rightarrow y} f_{\omega y} \theta_x(\omega), & y = z \end{cases} = \begin{cases} z, & x, y \neq z; \\ \sum_{\omega \rightarrow x} f_{\omega x} \omega, & x = z; \\ \sum_{\omega \rightarrow y} f_{\omega y} \theta_x(\omega), & y = z. \end{cases}$$

This implies $xyx = xy$. Observe that $\theta_x \circ \theta_y(z)$ has no y component for any z . Thus, by definition, θ_y acts as identity on $\theta_x \circ \theta_y(z)$ and we get $xy = yxy$. \square

In the case Γ is linearly ordered of type A_n , f is constantly equal to 1 and $\mathbb{Z} \subset \mathcal{R}$ we have that R_f is effective, as proved in [4]. We denote a constant function $E(\Gamma) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ with value c simply by $c \in \mathcal{R}$ and the corresponding representation by R_c .

Lemma 3.2. *Let Γ be linearly ordered of type A_n . Then any choice of the function f gives an effective representation R_f of HK_Γ .*

It is important to recall that all values of f are non-zero by definition.

Proof. For a linearly ordered Γ of type A_n each vertex of Γ is a target of at most one arrow. Therefore the definition of R_f implies that for any $v, x \in V(\Gamma)$ the linear transformation $R_f([v])$ maps x to a scalar multiple of some other vertex, say y . By induction on the length of a word it follows that for any $x \in V(\Gamma)$ and $[\mathbf{w}] \in HK_\Gamma$ there exists $v \in V(\Gamma)$ and $c_{x,f,\mathbf{w}} \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $R_f([\mathbf{w}])(x) = c_{x,f,\mathbf{w}}y$. Certainly, $c_{x,f,\mathbf{w}}$ depends on f . However, we claim that

$$(3.1) \quad c_{x,f,\mathbf{w}} \neq 0 \quad \text{implies that} \quad c_{x,f',\mathbf{w}} \neq 0 \quad \text{for any other} \quad f',$$

or, in other words, that the fact that $c_{x,f,\mathbf{w}}$ is non-zero does not depend on f . Claim (3.1) and effectiveness of R_1 established in [4] imply the claim of our lemma.

To prove claim (3.1) assume that $c_{x,f,\mathbf{w}} \neq 0$. Let $\mathbf{w} = w_k w_{k-1} \cdots w_1$ and set $y_0 = x$. For $i = 1, \dots, k$ define recursively y_i as the unique vertex of Γ such that $R_f([w_i w_{i-1} \cdots w_1])(x) = c_i y_i$ for some non-zero $c_i \in \mathcal{R}$. This is well-defined as $c_{x,f,\mathbf{w}} \neq 0$. We have $c_k = c_{x,f,\mathbf{w}} \neq 0$. The definition of R_f and the fact that \mathcal{R} is a domain imply that for f' we will have that $R_{f'}([w_i w_{i-1} \cdots w_1])(x) = c'_i y_i$ for some non-zero $c'_i \in \mathcal{R}$. In particular, $c'_k \neq 0$ and the claim follows. \square

Remark 3.3. We note that the representation R_f is not effective if Γ contains the subgraph

$$u \longrightarrow v \longleftarrow w$$

To simplify notation, let

$$A = \sum_{z \rightarrow v, z \neq w} f_{zv}z \text{ and } B = \sum_{z \rightarrow w, z \neq v} f_{zw}z.$$

Then $\theta_v(A) = \theta_w(A) = A$ and $\theta_v(B) = \theta_w(B) = B$. From the definition of R_f we have

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_v \circ \theta_w \circ \theta_v(v) &= \theta_v \circ \theta_w(f_{wv}w + A) = A + f_{wv}\theta_v \circ \theta_w(w) = \\ &= A + f_{wv}\theta_v(B + f_{vw}v) = A + f_{wv}B + f_{wv}f_{vw}\theta_v(v) = \\ &= A + f_{wv}B + f_{wv}f_{vw}(A + f_{wv}v) = A + f_{wv}B + f_{wv}f_{vw}A + f_{wv}^2f_{vw}v, \text{ while} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_w \circ \theta_v \circ \theta_w(v) &= \theta_w \circ \theta_v(v) = \\ \theta_w(A + f_{wv}w) &= A + f_{wv}\theta_w(w) = A + f_{wv}(B + f_{vw}v) = A + f_{wv}B + f_{wv}f_{vw}v. \end{aligned}$$

When we combine them we see that

$$\begin{aligned} A + f_{wv}B + f_{wv}f_{vw}A + f_{wv}^2f_{vw}v &= A + f_{wv}B + f_{wv}f_{vw}v \iff \\ f_{wv}f_{vw}A + f_{wv}^2f_{vw}v &= f_{wv}f_{vw}v. \end{aligned}$$

By definition of A it can not contain v as a summand, which gives $f_{wv}f_{vw}A = 0A$. By assumption, A contains u as a summand with non-zero coefficient, so $f_{wv}f_{vw} = 0$. Since \mathcal{R} is an integral domain, this implies $f_{wv} = 0$ or $f_{vw} = 0$. But f only takes nonzero values by definition. If we allow f to be zero on an edge $v \rightarrow w$ then straightforward calculations show that $R_f[wv] = R_f[vw]$, showing that f is not effective.

We say that a word \mathbf{w} is *multiplicity free with respect to a vertex v* if v appears at most once in \mathbf{w} . A word \mathbf{w} is called *multiplicity free* if it is multiplicity free with respect to every vertex. An element $[\mathbf{w}] \in HK_\Gamma$ is called *multiplicity free* if $[\mathbf{w}]$ contains a multiplicity free word. For $A \subset V(\Gamma)$ define $\mathcal{MF}_A \subset (V(\Gamma))^*$ as the set of words which are multiplicity free with respect to all vertices in A . Let $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_\Gamma \subset V(\Gamma)$ denote the set of all sources and sinks. Multiplicity free words are easier to handle because they allow us to speak about *the* position of a single vertex (assuming it exists). Recall that a *subword* of a word $v_1v_2 \dots v_k$ is a word of the form $v_{i_1}v_{i_2} \dots v_{i_j}$ where $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_j \leq k$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $A \subset \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathbf{w} \in (V(\Gamma))^*$. Then $[\mathbf{w}] \cap \mathcal{MF}_A$ contains a subword of \mathbf{w} . Furthermore, if $\mathbf{w} \sim \mathbf{w}'$ are both in \mathcal{MF}_A , then there exist a series of words $\mathbf{w}_i \in [\mathbf{w}] \cap \mathcal{MF}_A$, such that*

$$\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}_1 \approx \mathbf{w}_2 \approx \dots \approx \mathbf{w}_k = \mathbf{w}'.$$

Proof. If \mathbf{w} is already in \mathcal{MF}_A , we take $\mathbf{w}' = \mathbf{w}$ and we are done. Assume that $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}_1a\mathbf{w}_2a\mathbf{w}_3$ is a word with at least two occurrences of $a \in A$, and that a is a source (if a is a sink, a similar argument works with all words reversed). Because of our restrictions on Γ , for any $x \in V(\Gamma)$ we have one of the following:

- (1) $x = a$ and $ax = aa = aaa = axa$;

- (2) there is a directed edge from a to x and $ax = axa$;
- (3) a and x are nonadjacent and $ax = aax = axa$.

Note that we have the relation $ax = axa$ in all cases. Therefore, for $\mathbf{w}_2 = x_1x_2 \cdots x_k$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}_1 a x_1 x_2 \cdots x_k a \mathbf{w}_3 &\sim \mathbf{w}_1 a x_1 a x_2 \cdots x_k a \mathbf{w}_3 \sim \cdots \sim \mathbf{w}_1 a x_1 a x_2 a \cdots a x_k a \mathbf{w}_3 \sim \\ &\mathbf{w}_1 a x_1 a x_2 a \cdots a x_k \mathbf{w}_3 \sim \cdots \sim \mathbf{w}_1 a x_1 x_2 \cdots x_k \mathbf{w}_3 = \mathbf{w}_1 a \mathbf{w}_2 \mathbf{w}_3. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have lowered the multiplicity of a in \mathbf{w} while leaving all other vertices untouched. Let $\psi_a : (V(\Gamma))^* \rightarrow \mathcal{MF}_{\{a\}} \subset (V(\Gamma))^*$ be the function which removes superfluous a as above, and let $\psi = \psi_A$ be the composition of all ψ_a for $a \in A$. It is well-defined by the previous remark, and the fact that A is a finite set. Then we obtain the desired subword $\psi(\mathbf{w})$ of \mathbf{w} contained in $[\mathbf{w}] \cap \mathcal{MF}_A$. This proves the first claim of the lemma.

Given two words $\mathbf{w} \sim \tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ there is, by definition, a sequence of words $\mathbf{w}_i \in [\mathbf{w}]$, $i \in \underline{k}$, such that

$$\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}_1 \approx \mathbf{w}_2 \approx \cdots \approx \mathbf{w}_k = \tilde{\mathbf{w}}.$$

We want to show that if $\mathbf{a} \approx \mathbf{b}$, then $\psi(\mathbf{a}) \approx \psi(\mathbf{b})$, but it suffices to show that $\psi_a(\mathbf{a}) \approx \psi_a(\mathbf{b})$ for all $a \in A$. If $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b}$ this is trivial. Assume that $\mathbf{a} \neq \mathbf{b}$. By definition, $\mathbf{a} \approx \mathbf{b}$ means that $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}_l \mathbf{c} \mathbf{a}_r$ and $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{a}_l \mathbf{d} \mathbf{a}_r$, where $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{d}$ is an edge relation (or equality). Depending on the letters which appear in the edge relation, we consider different cases.

Case 1. Relations $x^2 = x, xyx = yxy = xy$ or $xy = yx$ for $x, y \notin A$. In this case the application of ψ_a affects neither \mathbf{c} nor \mathbf{d} . Assume that $a \in A$ is a source which appears in exactly one of the words \mathbf{a}_l or \mathbf{a}_r . Then the application of ψ_a to both \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} deletes all but the leftmost occurrences of a . If $a \in A$ is a source which appears in both \mathbf{a}_l and \mathbf{a}_r , then the application of ψ_a to both \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} deletes all occurrences of a in \mathbf{a}_r and all but the leftmost occurrences of a in \mathbf{a}_l . Similarly one considers the case when $a \in A$ is a sink. It follows that $\psi_a(\mathbf{a}) \approx \psi_a(\mathbf{b})$.

Case 2. Relations $a^2 = a, ax = xa$ and $axa = xax = ax$ where $a \in A$ and $x \notin A$. We assume that a is a source (the case when a is a sink is done similarly). If a appears in \mathbf{a}_l , then ψ_a deletes all a in \mathbf{a}_r , \mathbf{c} and \mathbf{d} (and leaves just the leftmost occurrences of a in \mathbf{a}_l). Note that our edge relations become $\varepsilon = \varepsilon, x = x$ and $x = x^2$, respectively. It follows that in this case $\psi_a(\mathbf{a}) \approx \psi_a(\mathbf{b})$. If a does not appear in \mathbf{a}_l , then ψ_a deletes all a in \mathbf{a}_r and leaves the leftmost occurrences of a in \mathbf{c} and \mathbf{d} . Note that our edge relations become $a = a, ax = xa$ and $ax = xax$, respectively. It follows that in this case we have $\psi_a(\mathbf{a}) \approx \psi_a(\mathbf{b})$, which may be equality, depending on the case.

Case 3. Relation $ab = ba$ where $a, b \in A$. Similarly to the above, the application of ψ_a does the same thing to the subword \mathbf{a}_l of both \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} , it does the same thing to the subword \mathbf{a}_r of both \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} , and it maps $ab = ba$ to either $ab = ba$ or $a = a$ or $b = b$ or $\varepsilon = \varepsilon$, depending on whether a or b appear in \mathbf{a}_l (if they are sources) or in \mathbf{a}_r (if they are sinks). In all cases we get that $\psi_a(\mathbf{a}) \approx \psi_a(\mathbf{b})$, which may be equality, depending on the case.

Case 4. Relation $aba = bab = ab$, where $a, b \in A$. Here a is a source and b is a sink. Similarly to the above, the application of ψ_a does the same thing to the

subword \mathbf{a}_l of both \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} and it does the same thing to the subword \mathbf{a}_r of both \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} . Depending on the appearance of a in \mathbf{a}_l and b in \mathbf{a}_r , the relation is either mapped to $ab = ab$ or to $a = a$ or to $b = b$ or to $\varepsilon = \varepsilon$. Again, in all cases we get that $\psi_a(\mathbf{a}) \approx \psi_a(\mathbf{b})$. The claim follows. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Let Γ be a simple directed graph with at most one edge between any pair of vertices. Let $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$ be a full subgraph and let \mathbf{w} be a word such that $\mathbf{c}[\mathbf{w}] = V(\Gamma')$. Then exactly one of the following is true:*

- (1) Γ' contains an oriented cycle and $[\mathbf{w}]^k$ are pairwise distinct for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (2) Γ' contains no oriented cycles and $[\mathbf{w}]^{|V(\Gamma')|}$ is the zero element in $HK_{\Gamma'}$.

Proof. Assume that Γ' contains an oriented cycle C (which then necessarily has length at least 3). Using $p : HK_{\Gamma} \rightarrow HK_C$ it is enough to prove the first claim under the assumption $\Gamma = \Gamma' = C$ (since if $p([\mathbf{w}]^k)$ are pairwise distinct for all k , then $[\mathbf{w}]^k$ are pairwise distinct for all k as well).

Let the vertices in C be enumerated by \underline{n} , such that there is a directed edge from v_i to v_{i+1} for all $i \in \underline{n}$. To separate elements, we choose the representation R_2 (with the ground ring $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{Z}$) and prove that the images $R_2([\mathbf{w}^k])$ are pairwise different. Recall that each θ_i maps v_i to $2v_{i-1}$ and v_j to v_j for $j \neq i$. It follows that there is a transformation $t : V(C) \rightarrow V(C)$ and a set of non-negative integers m_1, \dots, m_n such that $R_2([\mathbf{w}^k])(v_i) = 2^{m_i} v_{t(i)}$. Moreover, $\mathbf{c}[\mathbf{w}] = V(C)$ implies that $m_i \geq 1$ for each i . We define the sequence n_i by $R_2([\mathbf{w}^k])(v_{t^{i-1}(1)}) = 2^{n_i} v_{t^i(1)}$, and $\bar{n}_i = \sum_{j=1}^i n_j$, that is, $n_1 = m_1$, $n_2 = m_{t(1)}$, $n_3 = m_{t^2(1)}$, etc. Then

$$R_2([\mathbf{w}^k])(v_1) = 2^{n_1} R_2([\mathbf{w}^{k-1}])(v_{t(1)}) = \dots = 2^{\bar{n}_k} v_{t^k(1)}.$$

Since the exponent is strictly increasing in k , and since R_2 is effective, it follows that the action of $R_2[\mathbf{w}^k]$ is different for different k , and hence $[\mathbf{w}^k]$ are pairwise distinct elements.

Now assume that Γ contains no oriented cycles. Then HK_{Γ} is a quotient of Kiselman's semigroup and the second claim follows from [8, Lemma 12]. \square

Theorem 3.6. *There is a bijection between idempotents in HK_{Γ} and full subgraphs of Γ which do not contain any oriented cycles.*

Proof. Let $[\mathbf{w}] \in HK_{\Gamma}$ be an idempotent and $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$ be the full subgraph whose set of vertices is $\mathbf{c}[\mathbf{w}]$. Then Γ' contains no oriented cycles by the first claim of the previous lemma.

Conversely, let Γ' be a full subgraph of Γ which does not contain any oriented cycles. Then $HK_{\Gamma'}$ is a quotient of Kiselman's semigroup. In particular, $HK_{\Gamma'}$ is finite and contains a unique idempotent of maximal content, namely the zero element, see [8]. The claim follows. \square


4. MAIN RESULTS

A graph of type A_n consists of linearly ordered pieces which glue together in sources and sinks in the interior. The number of linearly ordered pieces is one less than the number of sources and sinks. Since we know a lot about effective representations for the pieces (see the previous section), we would like to know what the gluing does to representations.


Definition 4.1. Given a graph Γ and a vertex $a \in \Gamma$ the *source graph* S_a is the full subgraph of Γ with the vertex set

$$V(S_a) = \{v \in \Gamma \mid \text{there exists a directed path from } v \text{ to } a\}.$$


Example. Let Γ be the graph



Then S_7 is the graph



and S_6 is the graph



Lemma 4.2. For a vertex $a \in \Gamma$ let $p_a : HK_\Gamma \rightarrow HK_{S_a}$ be the canonical projection. Then for any $[\mathbf{w}] \in HK_\Gamma$ we have the equality $R_f([\mathbf{w}])(a) = R_f(p_a[\mathbf{w}])(a)$.

Proof. Let $x \in V(\Gamma)$ and $v \in S_a$. From the definition of R_f we have that the linear span L of all $v \in S_a$ is invariant with respect to the action of HK_Γ . Furthermore, for any $x \in V(\Gamma) \setminus S_a$ we have $R_f([x])(v) = v$ for all $v \in S_a$, which means that $R_f([x])$ acts as the identity on L . It follows that the actions of $R_f([\mathbf{w}])$ and $R_f(p_a[\mathbf{w}])$ on L coincide. \square

If $\Gamma = \cup_{i \in I} \Gamma_i$ is a union of full subgraphs which pairwise do not have any common edges and f^i is a collection of weight functions, then there is a unique weight

function f on Γ whose restriction to Γ_i coincides with f^i for every i . We call f the *extension* of the $\{f^i : i \in I\}$.

A subgraph $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$ is called *path complete* if every oriented path in Γ which starts from a vertex of Γ' and ends at a vertex of Γ' is contained entirely in Γ' . For example, if $\Gamma = 1 \longrightarrow 2 \longrightarrow 3$, then the full subgraph with vertices 1 and 2 is path complete while the full subgraph with vertices 1 and 3 is not path complete.

A path complete subgraph is always a full subgraph, but the converse is false, in general.

Let Γ' be a path complete subgraph of Γ and f a weight function on $E(\Gamma)$. Let f' denote the restriction of f to Γ' (with the corresponding representation $R_{f'}$ of $HK_{\Gamma'}$). Consider the representation R_f of HK_{Γ} on $W = \bigoplus_{v \in \Gamma} \mathcal{R}v$. Let $\Gamma'' = \cup_{v \in \Gamma'} S_v$ be the full subgraph of Γ whose set of vertices consists of all vertices of Γ from which there is an oriented (but maybe trivial) path to a vertex of Γ' . Clearly, Γ' is a subgraph of Γ'' . Finally, let Γ''' be the full subgraph of Γ whose set of vertices coincides with the set of all vertices of Γ'' which do not belong to Γ' . Then both $X = \bigoplus_{v \in \Gamma''} \mathcal{R}v$ and $Y = \bigoplus_{v \in \Gamma'''} \mathcal{R}v$ are invariant under the action of HK_{Γ} . Indeed, by construction Γ'' contains all arrows pointing to some vertex in Γ'' , which implies that X is invariant under the action of HK_{Γ} . The same reasoning is valid for Y when we add the fact that Γ' is path complete. Let ρ be the corresponding representation of HK_{Γ} on X/Y .

Proposition 4.3. *The representations ρ and $R_{f'} \circ p$ of HK_{Γ} are isomorphic.*

Proof. Define the map $\Phi : X/Y \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in \Gamma'} \mathcal{R}v$ as the unique \mathcal{R} -linear map which sends $v + Y$ for $v \in V(\Gamma')$ to v . This is obviously linear and bijective. The fact that it is a homomorphism of HK_{Γ} -modules follows directly from the definitions. \square

This proposition says that, for every word $\mathbf{w} \in (V(\Gamma))^*$, the minor of the matrix of $R_f([\mathbf{w}])$ corresponding to the basis vectors $\{v : v \in \Gamma'\}$ coincides with the matrix $R_{f'}(p[\mathbf{w}])$. This fails if Γ' is not path complete. For example, if we let $\Gamma = a \longrightarrow b \longrightarrow c$ and Γ' be the full subgraph with vertices a and c , then for $\mathbf{w} = bc$ and $f \equiv 1$ we have $R_1([bc])(c) = a$ while $R_1(p[bc])(c) = 0$.

Proposition 4.4. *Assume that Γ is a union of two full subgraphs, Γ_1 and Γ_2 , such that $V(\Gamma_1) \cap V(\Gamma_2) = \{a\}$ for some $a \in \mathcal{S}_{\Gamma}$. Then the map $p = (p_1, p_2) : HK_{\Gamma} \rightarrow HK_{\Gamma_1} \times HK_{\Gamma_2}$, where $p_i : HK_{\Gamma} \rightarrow HK_{\Gamma_i}$, $i = 1, 2$, are projection morphisms, is injective.*

Proof. Let Γ' denote the full subgraph of Γ with vertices $V(\Gamma) \setminus \{a\}$ and define Γ'_1 and Γ'_2 similarly. Assume that \mathbf{w} and \mathbf{w}' are such that $p[\mathbf{w}] = p(\mathbf{w}')$. We need to show that this implies $[\mathbf{w}] = [\mathbf{w}']$, or, equivalently, $\mathbf{w} \sim \mathbf{w}'$. Since $a \in \mathcal{S}_{\Gamma}$, by Lemma 3.4 every element $[\mathbf{w}] \in HK_{\Gamma}$ contains at least one word \mathbf{w}'' which is multiplicity free with respect to a , i.e. $\mathbf{w}'' = \mathbf{w}_1 a \mathbf{w}_2$ where $\alpha \in \{\varepsilon, a\}$ and $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2 \in HK_{\Gamma'}$. Each of \mathbf{w}_1 and \mathbf{w}_2 can be written on the form $\mathbf{w}_i = \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{y}_i$ for some $\mathbf{x} \in HK_{\Gamma'_1}$ and $\mathbf{y} \in HK_{\Gamma'_2}$. We do the same with \mathbf{w}' and denote the result with primes, that is $\mathbf{w}' = \mathbf{w}'_1 a \mathbf{w}'_2 = \mathbf{x}'_1 \mathbf{y}'_1 a \mathbf{x}'_2 \mathbf{y}'_2$. First note that a is in $\mathfrak{c}[\mathbf{w}]$ if, and only if, a is in $\mathfrak{c}[\mathbf{w}']$.

We claim that p^{-1} is given by $([\mathbf{x}_1\alpha\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}_1\alpha\mathbf{y}_2]) \mapsto [\mathbf{x}_1\mathbf{y}_1\alpha\mathbf{x}_2\mathbf{y}_2]$. We need to prove two things; a) the image of p consists of elements on that form, and b) the map p^{-1} is well-defined. The entire codomain of p consists of elements on the form $([\mathbf{x}], [\mathbf{y}])$, for some $\mathbf{x} \in HK_{\Gamma_1}$ and $\mathbf{y} \in HK_{\Gamma_2}$. We can factor $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_1\alpha_1\mathbf{x}_2$ and $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}_1\alpha_2\mathbf{y}_2$ by similar arguments as for \mathbf{w} above. When we restrict to the image, we impose the condition that $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha$. On the other hand, any element on the form $([\mathbf{x}_1\alpha\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}_1\alpha\mathbf{y}_2])$ is the image under p of the element $\mathbf{x}_1\mathbf{y}_1\alpha\mathbf{x}_2\mathbf{y}_2$, so the image does indeed consist precisely of the elements $\{([\mathbf{x}_1\alpha\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}_1\alpha\mathbf{y}_2])\}$. To prove that p^{-1} is well-defined, we divide into two cases, depending on if $\alpha = \varepsilon$ or $\alpha = a$. By assumption and construction we have the following relations, which we use without further comment:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_1\alpha\mathbf{x}_2 &\sim \mathbf{x}'_1\alpha\mathbf{x}'_2, \\ \mathbf{y}_1\alpha\mathbf{y}_2 &\sim \mathbf{y}'_1\alpha\mathbf{y}'_2 \text{ and} \\ \mathbf{xy} &\sim \mathbf{yx} \text{ for all decorations on } \mathbf{x} \text{ and } \mathbf{y}. \end{aligned}$$

If $\alpha = \varepsilon$, then $\mathbf{x}_1\mathbf{y}_1\mathbf{x}_2\mathbf{y}_2 \sim \mathbf{x}_1\mathbf{x}_2\mathbf{y}_1\mathbf{y}_2$ and it suffices to show that $\mathbf{x}_1\mathbf{x}_2\mathbf{y}_1\mathbf{y}_2 \sim \mathbf{x}'_1\mathbf{x}'_2\mathbf{y}'_1\mathbf{y}'_2$, but this follows in two steps from the relations above.

Now assume that $\alpha = a$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}'_1\mathbf{y}'_1\alpha\mathbf{x}'_2\mathbf{y}'_2 &\sim \mathbf{x}'_1\mathbf{y}'_1\alpha\mathbf{y}'_2\mathbf{x}'_2 \sim \mathbf{x}'_1\mathbf{y}_1\alpha\mathbf{y}_2\mathbf{x}'_2 \sim \\ &\sim \mathbf{y}_1\mathbf{x}'_1\alpha\mathbf{x}'_2\mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{y}_1\mathbf{x}'_1\alpha\mathbf{x}'_2\mathbf{y}_2 \sim \mathbf{y}_1\mathbf{x}_1\alpha\mathbf{x}_2\mathbf{y}_2 \sim \mathbf{x}_1\mathbf{y}_1\alpha\mathbf{x}_2\mathbf{y}_2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\mathbf{w}' \sim \mathbf{w}$ and the claim follows. \square

Theorem 4.5. *Let Γ , Γ_1 and Γ_2 be as in Proposition 4.4. Let f_1 and f_2 be weight functions for Γ_1 and Γ_2 , respectively and f be the extension of $\{f_1, f_2\}$ to Γ . Then the representation R_f of HK_{Γ} is effective if, and only if, the representations R_{f_1} of HK_{Γ_1} and R_{f_2} of HK_{Γ_2} are effective.*

Proof. Let Γ' , Γ'_1 and Γ'_2 be as in the proof of Proposition 4.4. Recall that the construction is such that any edge of Γ is either in Γ_1 or Γ_2 . We start with the ‘‘only if’’ part. Both Γ_1 and Γ_2 are path complete, which implies that

$$R_f[\mathbf{w}](v) = \begin{cases} R_{f_i}(p_i[\mathbf{w}])(v), & \text{if } v \in \Gamma'_i; \\ R_{f_1}(p_1[\mathbf{w}])(a) + R_{f_2}(p_2[\mathbf{w}])(a), & \text{if } v = a \text{ and } a \in \mathbf{c}[\mathbf{w}]; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Now assume that R_{f_1} is not effective, i.e. there exists $[\mathbf{w}_1] \neq [\mathbf{w}_2] \in HK_{\Gamma_2}$ such that $R_{f_1}([\mathbf{w}_1]) = R_{f_1}([\mathbf{w}_2])$. Then $p_2[\mathbf{w}_1] = p_2[\mathbf{w}_2](= [a] \text{ or } [\varepsilon])$, and

$$R_f([\mathbf{w}_1])(v) = \begin{cases} R_{f_1}(p_1[\mathbf{w}_1])(v), & \text{if } v \in \Gamma'_1; \\ R_{f_2}(p_2[\mathbf{w}_1])(v), & \text{if } v \in \Gamma'_2; \\ R_{f_1}(p_1[\mathbf{w}_1])(a) + R_{f_2}(p_2[\mathbf{w}_1])(a), & \text{if } v = a \text{ and } a \in \mathbf{c}[\mathbf{w}]. \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The ‘‘if’’ part follows by combining Propositions 4.3 and 4.4 (note again that both Γ_1 and Γ_2 are path connected in Γ). Assume that the representations R_{f_1} of HK_{Γ_1} and R_{f_2} of HK_{Γ_2} are effective and consider the representation R_f of HK_{Γ} . Let $[\mathbf{w}] \neq [\mathbf{w}']$ be two elements of HK_{Γ} . Assume $R_f([\mathbf{w}]) = R_f([\mathbf{w}'])$. Then

Propositions 4.3 and the arguments from the first part of the proof imply that $R_{f_1}(p_1([\mathbf{w}])) = R_{f_1}(p_1([\mathbf{w}']))$ and $R_{f_2}(p_2([\mathbf{w}])) = R_{f_2}(p_2([\mathbf{w}']))$. Since both R_{f_1} and R_{f_2} are effective, we get $p_1([\mathbf{w}]) = p_1([\mathbf{w}'])$ and $p_2([\mathbf{w}]) = p_2([\mathbf{w}'])$. Now from Proposition 4.4 we get $[\mathbf{w}] = [\mathbf{w}']$. The claim follows. \square

This statement can now be iterated as follows. Assume that Γ is a union of full subgraphs, $\Gamma = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i$, where $n > 1$, such that each pair of different subgraphs does not have any common edges and, moreover, we assume that for every $k = 2, 3, \dots, n$ there is $a_k \in \mathcal{S}_\Gamma$ such that

$$V(\Gamma_k) \cap \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} V(\Gamma_i) \right) = \{a_k\}.$$

In this case we say that Γ satisfies the *gluing condition*.

For example, let Γ be of type A_n . If we define Γ_i to be the maximal connected linearly ordered full subgraphs of Γ , then Γ satisfies the gluing condition with respect to these subgraphs as illustrated below (here Γ_i is a subgraph with vertices between a_i and a_{i+1} , where a_0 is the leftmost vertex and a_{k+1} is the rightmost vertex):

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} a_0 & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & a_1 & \longleftarrow & \cdots & \longleftarrow & a_3 & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & a_k & \longleftarrow & \cdots & \longleftarrow & a_{k+1} \\ & & & & \Gamma_1 & & & & \Gamma_2 & & & & \cdots & & & & \Gamma_{k+1} \end{array}$$

This implies the following corollary which answers [4, Question 8].

Corollary 4.6. *Let Γ be of type A_n . Then the representation R_1 of HK_Γ is effective.*

Proof. This follows from Theorem 4.5 and [4, Subsection 3.2] by induction on the number of internal sinks and sources. \square

As a byproduct of the proof of Proposition 4.4 we get formulae for certain cardinalities. An element $[\mathbf{w}]$ is said to have *maximal content* if $\mathfrak{c}[\mathbf{w}] = V(\Gamma)$. The sub-semigroup consisting of elements with maximal content is denoted by $\mathfrak{m}(\Gamma)$.

Theorem 4.7. *Assume that $\Gamma = \bigcup_{i=1}^k \Gamma_i$ satisfies the gluing condition. Then*

$$|\mathfrak{m}(\Gamma)| = \prod_{i=1}^k |\mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_i)|.$$

Proof. By induction, it suffices to prove the claim for $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$. All we need to show is that the restricted map $p : \mathfrak{m}(\Gamma) \rightarrow \mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1) \times \mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_2)$ is a bijection. Since we know that it is injective (by Proposition 4.4), we only have to establish its surjectivity. Let $([\mathbf{x}], [\mathbf{y}]) \in \mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1) \times \mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_2)$. By definition, $a \in \mathfrak{c}[\mathbf{x}]$ and $a \in \mathfrak{c}[\mathbf{y}]$, so

there are words $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbf{x}_1 a \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y} \sim \mathbf{y}_1 a \mathbf{y}_2$ which are multiplicity free with respect to a . Then $[\mathbf{x}_1 \mathbf{y}_1 a \mathbf{x}_2 \mathbf{y}_2]$ is the preimage of $([\mathbf{x}], [\mathbf{y}])$. The claim follows. \square

The Catalan numbers $C_n = \frac{1}{n+1} \binom{2n}{n}$ are the cardinalities of the HK-monoids of linearly ordered graphs, see [4, Theorem 1(vi)]. They can also be used to calculate the cardinality of any HK-monoid of type A_n .

Let $\Gamma = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k+1} \Gamma_i$ be a graph of type A_n as in (4.1) or its opposite. Specifically, it has $k+2$ sinks and sources, out of which k are gluing linearly ordered pieces together. Let $[\mathbf{w}]$ be an element in HK_Γ . Define its *signature* as $\mathfrak{s}[\mathbf{w}] := \mathfrak{c}[\mathbf{w}] \cap \mathcal{S}_\Gamma$. Similarly we define the local signature as $\mathfrak{s}_i[\mathbf{w}] := \mathfrak{c}[\mathbf{w}] \cap \mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k+1$. Clearly, the equality $\mathfrak{s}_i[\mathbf{w}] = \mathfrak{s}[\mathbf{w}] \cap \{i-1, i\}$ holds for all $1 \leq i \leq k+1$. In the calculations ahead, we use the set Q to keep track of signatures and the functions δ_i to calculate local signatures from a signature. The set $X_i(Q)$ will be the set of all elements in HK_{Γ_i} with local signature determined by Q . The functions c_i will count the cardinalities of the sets X_i .

For a subset $Q \subset \{1, 2, 3, \dots, k\}$ and $i \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots, k+1\}$ set

$$\delta_i(Q) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i \in Q; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

Let l_i be the length of the linearly ordered piece between sources and sinks labeled i and $i+1$, in terms of number of vertices. Alternatively l_i is one more than the number of arrows in that piece. Let the functions c_i be defined as follows:

$$c_i(Q) = \begin{cases} C_{l_{i-1}}, & \delta_{i-1}(Q) = \delta_i(Q) = 0; \\ C_i - C_{l_{i-1}}, & \delta_{i-1}(Q) + \delta_i(Q) = 1; \\ C_{i+1} - 2C_i + C_{l_{i-1}}, & \delta_{i-1}(Q) = \delta_i(Q) = 1, \end{cases}$$

for $2 \leq i \leq k$, and

$$c_1(Q) = \begin{cases} C_{l_1}, & \delta_1(Q) = 0; \\ C_{l_1+1} - C_{l_1}, & \delta_1(Q) = 1; \end{cases} \quad c_{k+1}(Q) = \begin{cases} C_{l_{k+1}}, & \delta_k(Q) = 0; \\ C_{l_{k+1}+1} - C_{l_{k+1}}, & \delta_k(Q) = 1. \end{cases}$$

Corollary 4.8. *Let Γ be as above. Then we have*

$$(i) \quad |\mathfrak{m}(\Gamma)| = \prod_{i=1}^{k+1} C_{l_i},$$

$$(ii) \quad |HK_\Gamma| = \sum_{Q \subset \underline{k+1}} \prod_{i=1}^{k+1} c_i(Q),$$

(iii) *if $\Gamma = \mathcal{S}_\Gamma$, that is,*

$$\Gamma = 1 \rightarrow 2 \leftarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \leftarrow \dots n \quad \text{or} \quad \Gamma = 1 \leftarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \leftarrow 4 \rightarrow \dots n,$$

then $|HK_\Gamma| = F_{2n+1}$ is the $(2n+1)$ -th Fibonacci number (where $F_1 = F_2 = 1$).

Proof. To prove the first claim we need to know $\mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_i)$ and then apply Theorem 4.7. Since Γ_i is linearly ordered, the elements of HK_{Γ_i} are in bijection with order preserving and order decreasing transformations on a set with $l_i + 1$ elements, see [4,

Theorem 1(vii)]. This bijection restricts to a bijection between $\mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_i)$ and transformations τ such that $\tau(j) < j$ for all $j \neq 1$. Changing j in the domain to $j - 1$ gives a bijection between $\mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_i)$ with order preserving and order decreasing transformations on a set with l_i elements and hence $|\mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_i)| = C_{l_i}$ by [4, Theorem 1(vi) and (vii)].

For the second claim we have to work more. Assume that $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ satisfies the gluing condition with $a \in \mathcal{S}_\Gamma$ as the common vertex. Then HK_Γ splits into two subsets (in fact subsemigroups) $A_\Gamma := \{[\mathbf{w}] \in HK_\Gamma \mid a \in \mathfrak{c}[\mathbf{w}]\}$ and $B_\Gamma := \{[\mathbf{w}] \in HK_\Gamma \mid a \notin \mathfrak{c}[\mathbf{w}]\}$. Similarly, $HK_{\Gamma_i} = A_{\Gamma_i} \cup B_{\Gamma_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$. The function p in Proposition 4.4 restricts to bijections

$$p : A_\Gamma \rightarrow A_{\Gamma_1} \times A_{\Gamma_2} \quad \text{and} \quad p : B_\Gamma \rightarrow B_{\Gamma_1} \times B_{\Gamma_2}.$$

By the multiplicative principle we have $|A_\Gamma| = |A_{\Gamma_1}| \cdot |A_{\Gamma_2}|$ and $|B_\Gamma| = |B_{\Gamma_1}| \cdot |B_{\Gamma_2}|$.

For $Q \subset \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and $i = 2, \dots, k + 1$, define $a_Q := \{a_i \mid i \in Q\}$ and

$$X_i(Q) := \{[\mathbf{w}] \in HK_{\Gamma_i} \mid \mathfrak{s}_i[\mathbf{w}] = a_Q \cap \{a_{i-1}, a_i\}\}$$

and set

$$\begin{aligned} X_1(Q) &:= \{[\mathbf{w}] \in HK_{\Gamma_1} \mid \mathfrak{s}[\mathbf{w}] = a_Q \cap \{a_1\}\} \\ X_{k+1}(Q) &:= \{[\mathbf{w}] \in HK_{\Gamma_{k+1}} \mid \mathfrak{c}[\mathbf{w}] = a_Q \cap \{a_k\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since every element has exactly one signature, we can sum over all possible signatures. For a fixed signature the multiplicativity which holds for two pieces translates to multiplicativity over all pieces. Put together we get the following formula:

$$(4.2) \quad |HK_\Gamma| = \sum_{Q \subset \underline{k} \setminus \{1\}} \prod_{i=1}^k |X_i(Q)|$$

To compute cardinalities of $X_i(Q)$ (and show that $c_i(Q) = |X_i(Q)|$, as claimed) we have to consider several cases. We start with the case $i \neq 1, k + 1$.

- (1) Assume that $i \notin Q$ and $i + 1 \notin Q$. If $a_i, a_{i+1} \notin \mathfrak{c}[\mathbf{w}_i]$, then $[\mathbf{w}_i]$ can be thought of as living in the smaller HK-monoid $HK_{\Gamma_i \setminus \{a_i, a_{i+1}\}}$, and vice versa. Since Γ_i was assumed to be linearly ordered, it will be the case for $\Gamma_i \setminus \{a_i, a_{i+1}\}$ as well. Note that all Γ_i have length $l_i \geq 2$ (if Γ has at least two vertices). Therefore $|HK_{\Gamma_i \setminus \{a_i, a_{i+1}\}}| = C_{l_i-1}$.
- (2) Assume that exactly one of $i, i + 1$ is in Q . Without loss of generality assume $i \in Q$. Similarly as above we count the number of elements that *do not* contain a_{i+1} . That cardinality is C_{l_i} . However, we need to exclude the elements that do not contain a_i , leaving us with exactly $C_{l_i} - C_{l_i-1}$.
- (3) If both of $i, i + 1$ are in Q , we use the inclusion exclusion formula to get $C_{l_{i+1}} - 2(C_{l_i} - C_{l_i-1}) - C_{l_i-1} = C_{l_{i+1}} - C_{l_i} + C_{l_i-1}$ elements.

When $i = 1$ or $i = k + 1$, we get the following two cases. Depending on i , let $a = a_1$ or a_k .

- (1) Elements in HK_{Γ_i} that do not contain a . There are C_{l_i} such elements.
- (2) Elements in HK_{Γ_i} that do contain a . By exclusion there are $C_{l_{i+1}} - C_{l_i}$ such elements.

Now the second claim of our theorem follows from (4.2) and the definition of $c_i(A)$.

We will prove the last claim by showing that it satisfies the same recursion formula as the odd Fibonacci numbers and has the same initial values. Note that if the number of vertices n is fixed there are only two possibilities for a graph of type A_n to have alternating sinks or sources (the first vertex can either be a sink or a source). However, these graphs are opposite to each other, so the cardinalities of the corresponding HK-monoids have to be the same by [4, Theorem 1(v)]. Let \mathcal{A}_n be the graph of type A_n with alternating sinks and sources whose vertices are v_i , $i \in \underline{n}$, and we assume that v_1 is a source. Let $f_n = |HK_{\mathcal{A}_n}|$. The first two \mathcal{A}_n are $\mathcal{A}_0 =$ the empty graph, and $\mathcal{A}_1 = v_1$. This gives $f_0 = |\{\varepsilon\}| = 1 = F_{2 \cdot 0 + 1}$ and $f_1 = |\{\varepsilon, [v_1]\}| = 2 = F_{2 \cdot 1 + 1}$. The Fibonacci numbers satisfy the recursion formula

$$F_{n+2} = F_{n+1} + F_n = 2F_n + F_{n-1} = 3F_n - F_{n-2}.$$

Thus we want to show that $f_{n+1} = 3f_n - f_{n-1}$. We can separate the elements of $HK_{\mathcal{A}_{n+1}}$ into two groups. Either the content of an element contains v_n or it does not.

- (1) Assume $v_n \notin \mathbf{c}[\mathbf{w}]$, then $[\mathbf{w}]$ equals an element from $HK_{\mathcal{A}_{n-1}}$ multiplied with either ε or v_{n+1} . Thus there are $f_{n-1} \cdot 2 = 2f_{n-1}$ such elements.
- (2) Assume $v_n \in \mathbf{c}[\mathbf{w}]$, then $[\mathbf{w}]$ is a product of an element from $HK_{\mathcal{A}_n}$ containing v_n with an element from $HK_{\mathcal{B}}$ containing v_n , where \mathcal{B} is the full subgraph of \mathcal{A}_{n+1} with vertices $\{v_n, v_{n+1}\}$. We have $(f_n - f_{n-1}) \cdot 3 = 3f_n - 3f_{n-1}$ such elements. The '3' in the formula corresponds to how v_{n+1} relates to v_n . Either there is no v_{n+1} or there is exactly one, and in that case it only matters if it comes before or after v_n .

This implies $f_{n+1} = 3f_n - f_{n-1}$ and completes the proof of our theorem. \square

The sequence F_{2n+1} was guessed with the help of [1] and has been found independently by Grensing [5].

Corollary 4.9. *Let Γ be of type A_n . Then the number of multiplicity free elements in HK_{Γ} is the Fibonacci number F_{2n+1} . In particular, it does not depend on the orientation of edges in Γ .*

Proof. Lemma 3.4 tells us that every element $[\mathbf{w}]$ contains a word \mathbf{w}' which is multiplicity free with respect to every source and sink. Since \mathcal{A}_n has only sources and sinks, every element of $HK_{\mathcal{A}_n}$ is in fact multiplicity free. Since $|HK_{\mathcal{A}_n}| = F_{2n+1}$ by the previous theorem, we need to show that there is a bijection between multiplicity free elements of HK_{Γ} and $HK_{\mathcal{A}_n}$. Let \mathbf{w} be a multiplicity free word and assume that Γ is enumerated canonically, i.e. such arrows connect vertices of difference 1. Then for each $i \in \underline{n-1}$ exactly one of the following holds.

- (1) $v_{i+1} \notin \mathbf{c}[\mathbf{w}]$.
- (2) $v_i \notin \mathbf{c}[\mathbf{w}]$ but $v_{i+1} \in \mathbf{c}[\mathbf{w}]$.
- (3) Both $v_i, v_{i+1} \in \mathbf{c}[\mathbf{w}]$ and v_i appears before v_{i+1} in \mathbf{w} .
- (4) Both $v_i, v_{i+1} \in \mathbf{c}[\mathbf{w}]$ and v_{i+1} appears before v_i in \mathbf{w} .

We claim that these properties do not depend on the choice of a *multiplicity free* word $\mathbf{w}' \in [\mathbf{w}]$. For the first two properties the claim is obvious. Let Γ_i be the complete subgraph of Γ whose vertices are v_i, v_{i+1} , and consider the map $p : (V(\Gamma))^* \rightarrow (V(\Gamma_i))^*$ defined by deletion of vertices not in Γ_i . It is clear that

- (a) If \mathbf{w} is multiplicity free, then so is $p(\mathbf{w})$.
- (b) If $\mathbf{w} \sim \mathbf{w}'$ then $p(\mathbf{w}) \sim p(\mathbf{w}')$.

This means that under p all multiplicity free words that contain both v_i and v_{i+1} are mapped to $v_i v_{i+1}$ or $v_{i+1} v_i$. However, there is an edge between v_i and v_{i+1} , so $v_i v_{i+1} \not\sim v_{i+1} v_i$, proving our claim for the third and the fourth properties.

We will show that multiplicity free elements are uniquely determined by the relative positions of v_i and v_{i+1} for each i . Set

$$\mathbf{w}_1 = \begin{cases} v_1, & \text{if } v_1 \in \mathbf{c}[\mathbf{w}]; \\ \varepsilon, & \text{if } v_1 \notin \mathbf{c}[\mathbf{w}]; \end{cases}$$

$$\mathbf{w}_{i+1} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{w}_i, & \text{if } v_{i+1} \notin \mathbf{c}[\mathbf{w}]; \\ \mathbf{w}_i v_{i+1}, & \text{if } v_i \notin \mathbf{c}[\mathbf{w}] \text{ or } v_i \text{ appears to the left of } v_{i+1} \text{ in } \mathbf{w}; \\ v_{i+1} \mathbf{w}_i, & \text{if } v_{i+1} \text{ appears to the left of } v_i \text{ in } \mathbf{w}. \end{cases}$$

Let $\mathfrak{M} \subset HK_\Gamma$ denote the set of all multiplicity free elements and define the map $\phi : \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow HK_{\mathcal{A}_n}$ by $\phi([\mathbf{w}]) = [\mathbf{w}_n]$, where \mathbf{w} is multiplicity free and \mathbf{w}_n is defined from \mathbf{w} by the above above. Note that ϕ is well-defined because it only uses invariant properties. Since $\phi : HK_{\mathcal{A}_n} \rightarrow HK_{\mathcal{A}_n}$ is the identity and the multiplicity free *words* are the same for all Γ (over the same vertices) it follows that ϕ is surjective for any domain. To show that ϕ is injective it suffices to show that $\mathbf{w} \sim \mathbf{w}_n$ (in HK_Γ) for each multiplicity free \mathbf{w} . We show this by deforming \mathbf{w} into \mathbf{w}_n . Clearly \mathbf{w} can be factorized as $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{x}_1 \mathbf{w}_1 \mathbf{y}_1$, where $v_1 \notin \mathbf{c}([\mathbf{x}_1]), \mathbf{c}([\mathbf{y}_1])$. Assume that $\mathbf{w} \sim \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{w}_i \mathbf{y}_i$ where $\{v_1, \dots, v_i\} \cap (\mathbf{c}([\mathbf{x}_i]) \cup \mathbf{c}([\mathbf{y}_i])) = \emptyset$. Note that \mathbf{w}_i commutes with every vertex *except* v_{i+1} .

- (1) If $v_{i+1} \notin \mathbf{c}([\mathbf{w}])$, then $\mathbf{w}_{i+1} = \mathbf{w}_i$.
- (2) If $v_i \notin \mathbf{c}([\mathbf{w}])$ but $v_{i+1} \in \mathbf{c}([\mathbf{w}])$ then \mathbf{w}_i commutes with every vertex of $\{v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\}$ and we may move it so that it ends up just to the left of v_{i+1} .
- (3) If both $v_i, v_{i+1} \in \mathbf{c}([\mathbf{w}])$ and v_i appears before v_{i+1} in \mathbf{w} then v_{i+1} is in \mathbf{y}_i and \mathbf{w}_i commutes with every vertex in \mathbf{y}_i preceding v_{i+1} . Hence, using edge relations, we may move \mathbf{w}_i so that it ends up just to the left of v_{i+1} .
- (4) If both $v_i, v_{i+1} \in \mathbf{c}([\mathbf{w}])$ and v_{i+1} appears before v_i in \mathbf{w} , then v_{i+1} is in \mathbf{x}_i , and we move \mathbf{w}_i so that it ends up just to the right of v_{i+1} .

In all cases we find that

$$\mathbf{w} \sim \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{w}_i \mathbf{y}_i \sim \mathbf{x}_{i+1} \mathbf{w}_{i+1} \mathbf{y}_{i+1}$$

for some \mathbf{x}_{i+1} and \mathbf{y}_{i+1} such that $\{v_1, \dots, v_i, v_{i+1}\} \cap (\mathbf{c}([\mathbf{x}_{i+1}]) \cup \mathbf{c}([\mathbf{y}_{i+1}])) = \emptyset$. Proceeding inductively, we get $\mathbf{w} \sim \mathbf{x}_n \mathbf{w}_n \mathbf{y}_n$ such that $\mathbf{c}([\mathbf{x}_n]) = \mathbf{c}([\mathbf{y}_n]) = \emptyset$, so $\mathbf{w} \sim \mathbf{w}_n$. \square

To illustrate the process that turns \mathbf{w} into \mathbf{w}_n let $\mathbf{w} = v_3v_6v_1v_4v_2$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_1\mathbf{w}_1\mathbf{y}_1 &= (v_3v_6)(v_1)(v_4v_2) & \mathbf{x}_2\mathbf{w}_2\mathbf{y}_2 &= (v_3v_6v_4)(v_1v_2)(\) & \mathbf{x}_3\mathbf{w}_3\mathbf{y}_3 &= (\)(v_3v_1v_2)(v_6v_4) \\ \mathbf{x}_4\mathbf{w}_4\mathbf{y}_4 &= (f)(v_3v_1v_2v_4)(\) & \mathbf{x}_5\mathbf{w}_5\mathbf{y}_5 &= (v_6)(v_3v_1v_2v_4)(\) & \mathbf{x}_6\mathbf{w}_6\mathbf{y}_6 &= (\)(v_3v_1v_2v_4v_6)(\) \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence of the previous corollary we have $F_{2n+1} \leq |HK_\Gamma|$ for any Γ . We also have $|HK_\Gamma| \leq C_{n+1}$ by [4, Theorem 1(vi)]. It seems plausible that more sources and sinks corresponds to a smaller monoid. The following theorem makes this idea more precise.

Theorem 4.10. *Let $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ be an edge disjoint union of graphs such that $\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2 = \{a\}$ is a source or a sink. Let $\tilde{\Gamma}_2$ be the graph obtained from Γ_2 by reversing the direction of all edges and let $\tilde{\Gamma} = \Gamma_1 \cup \tilde{\Gamma}_2$. Then $|HK_\Gamma| \leq |HK_{\tilde{\Gamma}}|$ and the equality holds if and only if a is isolated in at least one of Γ_1, Γ_2 .*

Proof. For any HK-monoid $HK_{\Gamma'}$ and $a \in V(\Gamma')$ define

$$HK_{\Gamma'}^0 = \{[\mathbf{w}] \in HK_{\Gamma'} \mid a \notin \mathbf{c}[\mathbf{w}]\},$$

$$HK_{\Gamma'}^1 = \{[\mathbf{w}] \in HK_{\Gamma'} \mid a \in \mathbf{c}[\mathbf{w}] \text{ and } [\mathbf{w}] \text{ is multiplicity free with respect to } a\}, \text{ and}$$

$$HK_{\Gamma'}^2 = \{[\mathbf{w}] \in HK_{\Gamma'} \mid [\mathbf{w}] \text{ is not multiplicity free with respect to } a\}.$$

Clearly $HK_{\Gamma'}$ is a disjoint union of $HK_{\Gamma'}^0$, $HK_{\Gamma'}^1$, and $HK_{\Gamma'}^2$.

Because $|HK_{\Gamma'}| = |HK_{\tilde{\Gamma}'}|$ by [4, Theorem 1(v)], it follows that

$$|HK_{\Gamma}^0| = |HK_{\Gamma_1 \setminus \{a\}}| |HK_{\Gamma_2 \setminus \{a\}}| = |HK_{\Gamma_1 \setminus \{a\}}| |HK_{\tilde{\Gamma}_2 \setminus \{a\}}| = |HK_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^0|.$$

To see that $|HK_{\Gamma}^1| = |HK_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^1|$ observe that any element $[\mathbf{w}]$ in HK_{Γ}^1 has a word of the form $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{x}_1\mathbf{y}_1a\mathbf{x}_2\mathbf{y}_2$ for some $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in HK_{\Gamma_1 \setminus \{a\}}, \mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2 \in HK_{\Gamma_2 \setminus \{a\}}$. Similarly for $HK_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^1$. This is true because there are no edges between $\Gamma_1 \setminus \{a\}$ and $\Gamma_2 \setminus \{a\}$. Let $\phi : HK_{\Gamma}^1 \rightarrow HK_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^1$ be defined by $\phi[\mathbf{x}_1\mathbf{y}_1a\mathbf{x}_2\mathbf{y}_2] = \mathbf{x}_1\overleftarrow{\mathbf{y}}_2a\mathbf{x}_2\overleftarrow{\mathbf{y}}_1$, where $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{y}}$ is the reverse of \mathbf{y} . Note that ϕ is a bijection if it is well-defined. To see that it is well-defined, assume $\mathbf{x}_1\mathbf{y}_1a\mathbf{x}_2\mathbf{y}_2 \sim \mathbf{x}'_1\mathbf{y}'_1a\mathbf{x}'_2\mathbf{y}'_2$. By taking the projection morphisms (onto HK_{Γ_1} and HK_{Γ_2} , respectively) we obtain $\mathbf{x}_1a\mathbf{x}_2 \sim \mathbf{x}'_1a\mathbf{x}'_2$ and $\mathbf{y}_1a\mathbf{y}_2 \sim \mathbf{y}'_1a\mathbf{y}'_2$. Note that $\mathbf{y} \sim \mathbf{y}' \iff \overleftarrow{\mathbf{y}} \sim \overleftarrow{\mathbf{y}'}$. We have:

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \phi(\mathbf{w}) &= \phi(\mathbf{x}_1\mathbf{y}_1a\mathbf{x}_2\mathbf{y}_2) = \mathbf{x}_1\overleftarrow{\mathbf{y}}_2a\mathbf{x}_2\overleftarrow{\mathbf{y}}_1 \sim \mathbf{x}_1\overleftarrow{\mathbf{y}}_2a\overleftarrow{\mathbf{y}}_1\mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{x}_1\overleftarrow{\mathbf{y}}_1a\overleftarrow{\mathbf{y}}_2\mathbf{x}_2 \sim \\ &\xleftarrow{\quad} \mathbf{x}_1\overleftarrow{\mathbf{y}}_1a\overleftarrow{\mathbf{y}}_2\mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{x}_1\overleftarrow{\mathbf{y}}_2a\overleftarrow{\mathbf{y}}_1\mathbf{x}_2 \sim \mathbf{y}'_2\mathbf{x}_1a\mathbf{x}_2\mathbf{y}'_1 \sim \mathbf{y}'_2\mathbf{x}'_1a\mathbf{x}'_2\mathbf{y}'_1 \sim \mathbf{x}'_1\mathbf{y}'_2a\mathbf{x}'_2\mathbf{y}'_1 = \phi(\mathbf{w}'). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $|HK_{\Gamma}^1| = |HK_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^1|$.

Thus we have the inequality

$$|HK_\Gamma| = |HK_\Gamma^0| + |HK_\Gamma^1| + |HK_\Gamma^2| = |HK_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^0| + |HK_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^1| + |HK_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^2| = |HK_{\tilde{\Gamma}}|.$$

It remains to show that the inequality is an equality precisely when a is isolated in at least one of Γ_1 and Γ_2 . Assume that a is isolated in Γ_1 . Then a is a source in $\tilde{\Gamma}$ if it is a sink in Γ and a sink in $\tilde{\Gamma}$ if it is a source in Γ . In any case, the set $HK_{\tilde{\Gamma}_2}$ is empty, and the inequality is an equality. The case when a is isolated in Γ_2 follows by symmetry. Note that a can be isolated in Γ_1 and Γ_2 simultaneously, which is the case precisely when a is both a sink and a source at the same time.

Now assume that a is *not* isolated in Γ_1 or Γ_2 . Then there exists one of the following subgraphs of Γ , depending on if a is a sink or a source:

$$b \longrightarrow a \longleftarrow c \quad \text{or} \quad b \longleftarrow a \longrightarrow c ,$$


for some b in Γ_1 and c in Γ_2 . In \tilde{G} , the same subgraphs turn into

$$b \longrightarrow a \longrightarrow c \quad \text{or} \quad b \longleftarrow a \longleftarrow c .$$

In either case we have $[abca] \in HK_{\tilde{\Gamma}}^2$, proving that the inequality is in fact strict. \square

Note that if Γ is cycle free, then so is $\tilde{\Gamma}$. Thus only finitely many elements can make up the difference between the corresponding Hecke-Kiselman monoids.

We illustrate the use of the theorem by the following figure with graphs of type A_5 . We put one graph above another if we based on the theorem, together with reversals or graph isomorphisms, can tell that the Hecke-Kiselman monoid of the first has more elements than the Hecke-Kiselman monoid of the second.




5. LIMITS AND EXTENSIONS OF THE METHOD

The main idea of taking smaller graphs, whose HK-monoids have known effective representations, and gluing them together has a few limitations:

- (1) We only know effective representations for a few types of graphs *that themselves are not reached in this way*. So far we have the linearly ordered graphs of type A_n and the graphs κ_n of the Kiselman monoids.
- (2) When we glue two subgraphs together we are limited to gluing sinks to sinks and sources to sources. In particular we can not handle trees in general, but only trees which branch in sources and sinks.
- (3) When we glue two subgraphs together the intersection must consist of one vertex. In particular we can not handle cycles (which give infinite monoids HK_{Γ} , but nevertheless could have finite effective dimension).

We may enlarge the set of “building blocks” by considering the following family of graphs:



We can get a complete description of the elements in HK_{Z_n} by observing that, since a is a source, any element contains a word with at most one a . The subwords before and after a do not contain a and could therefore be thought of as living in $(V(Z_n \setminus \{a\}))^*$. However, in $Z_n \setminus \{a\}$ every vertex is a sink or a source, so we may assume that there is at most one v_i on each side of a . A similar argument holds for b . Thus each element $[\mathbf{w}]$ in HK_{Z_n} contains a word \mathbf{w}' which falls into exactly one of the following types:

- (1) We have $a, b \notin \mathfrak{c}[\mathbf{w}']$ and \mathbf{w}' multiplicity free. Since all v_i commute with each other we may take $\mathbf{w}' = v_{i_1}v_{i_2} \cdots v_{i_j}$ with $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_j$.
- (2) We have $a \in \mathfrak{c}[\mathbf{w}'], b \notin \mathfrak{c}[\mathbf{w}']$ and $\mathbf{w}' = \mathbf{w}_1 a \mathbf{w}_2$ is multiplicity free. Similarly as in the first case, $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2$ may be taken with internally increasing order.
- (3) We have $a \notin \mathfrak{c}[\mathbf{w}'], b \in \mathfrak{c}[\mathbf{w}']$ and $\mathbf{w}' = \mathbf{w}_1 b \mathbf{w}_2$ is multiplicity free. As in the second case, $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2$ may be taken with internally increasing order.
- (4) We have $a, b \in \mathfrak{c}[\mathbf{w}']$ and $\mathbf{w}' = \mathbf{w}_1 a \mathbf{w}_2 b \mathbf{w}_3$. We may take \mathbf{w}' such that $\mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{w}_1) \cap \mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{w}_2) = \emptyset$ and $\mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{w}_2) \cap \mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{w}_3) = \emptyset$ and $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2$ and \mathbf{w}_3 are internally increasing.
- (5) We have $a, b \in \mathfrak{c}[\mathbf{w}']$ and $\mathbf{w}' = \mathbf{w}_1 b \mathbf{w}_2 a \mathbf{w}_3$ with the same restrictions as in the previous case and, additionally, $\mathbf{w}_2 \neq \varepsilon$.

The proof of the next theorem shows that all these elements are, in fact, different.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\Gamma = Z_n$ and let f be defined by $f_{av_i} = 1, f_{v_i b} = 2^i$ for all i . Then R_f is an effective representation of HK_{Z_n} .*

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on n in the claim “the elements of Z_n are described as above and R_f is an effective representation of HK_{Z_n} ” for $n \geq 3$. The base case, $n = 3$, is obvious. Assume that the claim is true for some $n - 1 \geq 3$. Now we want to prove the claim for n .

First we note that $R_f([\mathbf{w}])(x) = x$ if and only if $x \notin \mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{w})$. This means that R_f distinguishes elements with different contents from each other. Assume first that the content of \mathbf{w} satisfies $a \notin \mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{w})$ or $b \notin \mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{w})$. Then $[\mathbf{w}]$ belongs to some $HK_{\Gamma'}$ for which Γ' is a path connected subgraph of Γ and is a finite edge-disjoint union of graphs of type A_2 . Since Γ has no oriented cycles, there is an $HK_{\Gamma'}$ -subquotient of R_f isomorphic, as a vector space, to $\bigoplus_{v \in V(\Gamma')} \mathcal{R}v$ with the induced action (i.e. everything outside this space is treated as zero). From the results of the previous

section it follows that the restriction of R_f to the action of $HK_{\Gamma'}$ on $\oplus_{v \in V(\Gamma')} \mathcal{R}v$ is effective and hence separates different elements with content $\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w})$.

If $a, b \in \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w})$ but some $v_i \notin \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w})$. Without loss of generality assume that $i = n$. This brings us to Z_{n-1} , which by the induction assumption is fine.

Finally, it remains to show that R_f separates elements of the maximal content, that is elements described in the last two cases (4) and (5) before the theorem with the condition $\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_1) \cup \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_2) \cup \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_3) = \{v_3, v_4, \dots, v_n\}$.

A direct computation shows that the element $\mathbf{w}_1 a \mathbf{w}_2 b \mathbf{w}_3$ from (4) acts on the basis elements of $\oplus_{v \in V(\Gamma')} \mathcal{R}v$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} a \mapsto 0; \quad b \mapsto \sum_{v_i \notin \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_1)} f_{av_i} v_i + \sum_{v_i \in \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_1)} f_{av_i} f_{v_i b} a; \\ \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_3) \ni v_i \mapsto 0; \quad \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_2) \ni v_i \mapsto f_{v_i b} b; \quad \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_1) \setminus \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_3) \ni v_i \mapsto f_{v_i b} b. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the element $\mathbf{w}_1 b \mathbf{w}_2 a \mathbf{w}_3$ from (5) acts as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} a \mapsto 0; \quad b \mapsto \sum_{v_i \notin \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_1) \setminus \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_2)} f_{av_i} v_i + \sum_{v_i \in \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_1) \setminus \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_2)} f_{av_i} f_{v_i b} a; \\ \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_3) \ni v_i \mapsto 0; \quad \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_2) \ni v_i \mapsto 0; \quad \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_1) \setminus \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_3) \ni v_i \mapsto f_{v_i b} b. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing these two formulae it is easy to see that different words act differently, in particular, they define different elements in HK_{Z_n} . \square

We can describe the graphs whose HK-monoids we have constructed effective representations for. We do it in three steps.


- (1) Pick a forest Γ' whose edges are undirected.
- (2) Direct every edge such that every vertex in Γ' becomes either a source or a sink. Call the resulting graph Γ''
- (3) Replace every edge in Γ'' independently with one of the following:
 - (a) a linearly ordered graph of type $A_n, n \geq 1$,
 - (b) a "Kiselman graph" $\kappa_n, n \geq 2$,
 - (c) or some Z_n for $n \geq 4$,

matching source to source and sink to sink. Call the resulting graph Γ .


By choosing any (integer) weights on the linearly ordered parts, weights according to [8] on the "Kiselman graph"-parts and weights according to the previous theorem on the Z_n -parts one obtains an effective representation of HK_{Γ} over any ground ring $\mathcal{R} \supset \mathbb{Z}$.

Example. A graph that we can reach with the three step algorithm


(1) Pick a forest:



(2) Direct the edges so that vertices become *only* sources and sinks:



(3) Replace edges with linearly ordered A_n -graphs, graphs κ_n or graphs Z_n :



REFERENCES

- [1] The on-line encyclopedia of integer sequences. oeis.org
- [2] R. Aragona and A. D'Andrea. Hecke-kiselman monoids of small cardinality. *Semigroup Forum*, 86(1):32–40, 2013.
- [3] E. Collina and A. D'Andrea. A graph-dynamical interpretation of Kiselman's semigroups. *J Algebra*, 41(1115):1115–1132, 2015.
- [4] O. Ganyushkin and V. Mazorchuk. On kiselman quotients of 0-hecke monoids. *IEJA*, 10:174–191, 2011.
- [5] A.-L. Gensing. Monoid algebras of projection functors. *J. Algebra*, 369(1):16–41, 2012.
- [6] A.-L. Gensing and V. Mazorchuk. Categorification of the Catalan monoid. *Semigroup Forum*, 89: 155–168, 2014.

- [7] C. Kiselman. A semigroup of operators in convexity theory. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 354(5):2035–2053, 2002.
- [8] G. Kudryavtseva and V. Mazorchuk. On kiselman’s semigroup. *Yokohama Math. J.*, 55(1):21–46, 2009.
- [9] V. Mazorchuk and B. Steinberg. Effective dimension of finite semigroups. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 216(12):2737–3753, Dec. 2012.
- [10] A.-L. Paasch. *Monoidalgebren von Projektionsfunktoren*. PhD thesis, Bergischen Universität Wuppertal, 2011.